REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 and 27-40 remain pending. Applicants do not propose any claim amendments.

Rejection of Claims 1-9 and 27-39

On page 2 of the Final Office Action of March 13, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 27-39 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,073,177 to Hebel et al. ("Hebel"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a communication system. The communication system includes, among other things, a first client device for performing data processing functions, the first client device for establishing a communication link with a server, for receiving a copy of client software from the server in response to the communication link being established, and for **using the copy of the client software to perform data synchronization with the server to obtain a portion of information**.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Hebel, at col. 4, lines 37-65 and col. 5, lines 15-34, discloses or suggests the above-mentioned feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Hebel, at col. 4, lines 37-65, discloses:

> Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) is a well known standard where TCP controls the data transfer and IP provides the routing through hardware connections 15 between client workstations 11 and servers 13. The invention relies on the Berkeley compatible TCP/IP functions to implement with the hardware the core communications for connecting client workstations 11 to the server 13. Essentially, this protocol requires programs to have a 32-bit IP address and a 16-bit port number in order to provide connectivity. IP addresses resolve machine locations, and port numbers are used to resolve client and server

> process locations on the client workstation. At any one instance, the combined IP address and port number may be used to uniquely identify any client workstation 11 or server application.
>
> The client workstations 11 and server 13 have three stages of operation--startup, event handling, and shutdown. The server 13, on startup, will query the host machine's IP address and write both the IP address and the user supplied port number into the database's access log file. The client workstations 11 on startup, will read the server specific IP address and port number from the same file as illustrated in FIG. 3. This is necessary for two reasons: First, there is only one server per database. Any attempt to start a subsequent server for the same project would fail, because the file is being accessed by the initial server. Second, this allows the client workstations to find the server, since the user can start the server on any workstation machine.

Thus, Hebel discloses that client workstations and servers use the well-known TCP/IP protocol. A combined IP address and port number may be used to uniquely identify any client workstation application or server application. Client workstations and servers have three stages of operation - startup, event handling, and shutdown. At startup, client workstations read a server specific IP address and port number from the same file. This permits client workstations to find the server.

Applicants note, however, that Hebel is completely devoid of any disclosure of the first client device establishing a communication link with a server, for receiving a copy of client software from the server in response to the communication link being established, and **using the copy of the client software (received via the established communication link with the server) to perform data synchronization with the server to obtain a portion of information (from a database), as required by claim 1**. Even if all client workstations use copies of client software to perform data synchronization, a point which Applicants do not concede, Hebel does not disclose or suggest that a client device receives a copy of the client software from the server in response to the communication link being established and **uses the copy of the client software to perform data synchronization with the server**. Further, Applicants submit that a request from a client workstation to establish a connection using the IP address and port number

from a file, as disclosed by Hebel, would only cause an attempt to establish the connection with an application on the server and would not cause the client workstation to receive a copy of an application that the client workstation would then use to perform data synchronization with the server, as required by claim 1.

Hebel, at col. 5, lines 15-34, discloses:

> Within TCP/IP, two different classes of sockets exist--stream and datagram. Stream sockets provide two-way communications and require a connected session. They provide reliability for data transfer and guarantee integrity of the data. Datagram sockets, however, provide only one-way communications. They neither ensure reliability in the data transfer nor guarantee integrity of data and do not require a connected session. For these reasons, the invention requires stream sockets.
>
> Once a stream socket is setup, event processing can begin. Events include a client workstation 11 connection to the server 13, a client workstation 11 disconnect from the server 13, the server disconnect from a workstation client, and incoming messages to workstation clients 11 or the server 13. Standard techniques are used for handling connect and disconnect events, but a special technique described below is used for handling messages.

Thus, Hebel discloses that stream sockets provide reliable two-way communications and that datagram sockets provide one-way communication with no guarantee of reliability or data integrity. Once a stream socket is established, event processing may begin. However, the above-cited portion of Hebel, as well as any other portion of Hebel, fails to disclose or suggest that a client device receives a copy of the client software from the server in response to the communication link being established and the client device **uses the copy of the client software to perform data synchronization with the server**.

For the above-mentioned reasons, Hebel fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1. In particular, Hebel fails to disclose:

> a first client device for performing data processing functions, said first client device for establishing a communication link with said server, **for receiving a copy of said client software from said server** in response to said communication link being established, and for **using the copy of said client software to perform**

the data synchronization with said server to obtain a portion of said information *(emphasis added)*

as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 either directly or as a base claim. Therefore, claims 2-9 are not anticipated by Hebel for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-9 be withdrawn.

Claims 27 and 34 recite features similar to those of claim 1. Applicants submit that independent claim 27, dependent claims 28-33, independent claim 34 and dependent claims 35-39 are not anticipated by Hebel for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 27-39 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 10 and 40

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hebel in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,636,873 to Carini et al. ("Carini"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 10 and 40 depend from claims 1 and 34, respectively, either directly or as a base claim. Claims 1 and 34 are not anticipated by Hebel for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicants submit that Carini fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Hebel. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10 and 40 be withdrawn.

Applicants' Comments Regarding the Examiner's Response to Arguments

On page 9 of the Final Office Action of March 13, 2006, the Examiner provided his comments with respect to Applicants' arguments in the remarks section of the response filed

December 22, 2005. In the Examiner's response, the Examiner continued to argue that Hebel discloses a first client work station 11 establishing a communication link with a server 13, for receiving a copy of client software from the server. Applicants wish to point out that Hebel fails to disclose or suggest, and **claim 1 requires that the first client device use the copy of the client software received from the server to perform data synchronization with the server**. Independent claims 27 and 34 recite similar features. The Examiner's Response to Arguments completely failed to address this deficiency of Hebel.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 12, 2006

By: 

Correspondence Address:
Cust. No. 49637
Berry & Associates, P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
Phone: (310) 247-2860
Fax: (310) 247-2864

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-414-3056